

Appln. No. 09/856,050
Amd. dated January 12, 2005
Reply to Office Action of October 19, 2004

REMARKS

The Office Action and the cited and applied references have been carefully reviewed. Claims 1 and 6 are allowed. Claim 17 also presently appear in the pending set of claims and define patentable subject matter warranting its allowance.

Reconsideration and allowance are hereby respectfully solicited.

Claim 17 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 17 is now amended as suggested by the examiner, thereby obviating this rejection.

Claim 13 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Invitrogen 1997 product catalog in view of Yamashiro et al. This rejection is made moot by the cancellation of rejected claim 13 without prejudice.

In view of the above, the claims comply with 35 U.S.C. §112 and define patentable subject matter warranting their allowance. Favorable consideration and early allowance are earnestly urged.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By



Allen C. Yun
Registration No. 37,971

ACY:pp
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\A\Aoyb\Uemura8\PTO\AMD final revised OA 4-21-04.doc